

REMARKS

Currently, claims 45-51 are pending in the application, of which claims 46-50 are withdrawn from further consideration. Accordingly, claims 45 and 51 are currently active in this application, of which both are independent.

In view of the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Allowed Claim

Applicant appreciates the indications that claim 51 is allowed. While Applicant agrees this claim is patentable over the cited references, Applicant does not agree that patentability resides in each feature exactly as expressed in the claim, nor that each feature is required for patentability of the claim.

Finality of the Office Action

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Applicant's previous amendment necessitated the new ground of rejection and hence the action is made final. However, in the previous response, claim 45 was amended to correct informalities therein. Specifically speaking, claim 45 was amended only to insert "of" and "the", which should not necessitate a new ground of rejection. Thus, withdrawal of the finality is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,442,470 issued to Hashimoto ("Hashimoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As MPEP 2131 indicates, in order for a reference to anticipate a claim, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). MPEP 2131 further indicates that "the elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required." *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

With this in mind, claim 45 recites:

"45. A display device, comprising:
a mold frame;
a display panel mounted on an upper surface of the mold frame;
a flexible printed circuit (FPC) attached to the display panel and having a driver integrated circuit (IC) formed thereon; and
a groove formed on a lower surface of the mold frame, the groove receiving the driver IC when *the FPC is bent toward the lower surface of the mold frame.*"

Thus, according to claim 45, the flexible printed circuit is attached to the display panel and bent toward the lower surface of the mold frame. Also, the driver IC is formed on the flexible printed circuit.

In this regard, Fig 2 of Hashimoto does not show the printed circuit board 3 being bent in any direction. Also, there is no support from Hashimoto that the printed circuit board 3 is flexible. Further, the printed circuit board 3 is not attached to the liquid

crystal panel 1. Thus, Hashimoto fails to disclose a structure that is identical to and as complete detail as is contained in claim 45. Also, Hashimoto fails to disclose a structure that is arranged as required by claim 45.

For these reasons, it is submitted that Hashimoto does not anticipate claim 45. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 45.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As mentioned above, Fig. 2 of Hashimoto fails to disclose a flexible printed circuit board being flexible and bent in any direction. Thus, even if the structure of Fig. 2 is modified to have an IC formed on the circuit board 3, the asserted modification would still fail to show the printed circuit board 3 being (a) attached to the display panel 1 and (b) bent toward the lower surface of the holder member 4, as claimed.

For these reasons, it is submitted that claim 45 is patentable over Hashimoto. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 45.

Conclusion


Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection

have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: September 16, 2005

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5000
Fax: 703-712-5050
HCP/WSC/tmk

\\COM\536229.1